

REMARKS

In response to the final Office Action dated 6 May 2003, the applicant requests reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-33 are pending in the application, and are rejected. None of the claims has been amended.

Telephone Interviews

The applicant thanks Examiner D'Agosta for the telephone interview granted on Monday, 23 June 2003, between himself and the applicant's representative Mr. Mates (Reg. No. 35,271). The applicant also thanks Examiner Trost for the telephone interview granted on Thursday, 26 June 2003, between himself and Mr. Mates. The final Office Action was discussed during the interviews, and no agreement was reached.

Information Disclosure Statement

The applicant respectfully requests the Information Disclosure Statement filed herewith be entered and that the documents listed on the attached Form 1449 be considered by the Examiner and made of record.

Also attached is a copy of a Written Opinion from a related application.

Rejections of Claims Under §103

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-16, 18-23, 25-27, 28-29, and 31-33 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,075,484, Daniel) in view of Grubb et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,768,684, Grubb) and Yun (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,295). Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniel, Grubb, and Yun, and further in view of Bolganio et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,663,990, Bolganio). Claims 2, 17, 24, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniel, Grubb, and Yun, and further in view of Roddy et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,127,740, Roddy).

The applicant respectfully traverses for the reasons stated in the applicant's response filed on 16 April 2003. The applicant also respectfully requests that the final Office Action be reconsidered in light of the Information Disclosure Statement filed herewith, and a Written

Serial Number: 09/652773

Dkt: 884.313US1 (INTEL)

Filing Date: August 31, 2000

Title: TRANSMIT POWER CONTROL WITHIN A WIRELESS TRANSMITTER

Assignee: Intel Corporation

Opinion (copy attached) from a related application. The applicant respectfully submits that the final Office Action did not identify any prior art evidence as the source of the suggestions for modifying Daniel, as is required by *In re Lee*. The applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 1-33 has **not** been established in the final Office Action, and that claims 1-33 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

The applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney at 612-373-6973 to discuss any questions which may remain with respect to the present application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,


ERIC A. JACOBSEN

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
612-373-6973

Date 25 JULY 2003

By


Robert E. Mates
Reg. No. 35,271

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 25 day of July, 2003

Name

KACIA LEE

Signature

Kacia Lee